Remarks

Claims 2-10 and 12 are now presented.

Claims 2-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Catlin, et al.

The rejections state Catlin discloses (sic) an external mirror assembly comprising a housing having an interior, a rim configured to limit pivoting of the mirror assesmbly and a covering. Also, the assembly is said to include a holder extending through the housing, a carrier plate defining a base portion attachable to the holder, a plurality of openings with the carrier plate spaced apart from the rim and the covering. The rejection further states the carrier plate is connected to the holder but not the covering. The rejection further states the reference does not teach a clamping mechanism securing the plate to the holder suggesting such involves no more than choice.

The rejection over Catlin, et al is respectfully traversed.

The Catlin, et al patent is directed to an exterior mirror mounting for a vehicle.

The arrangement includes a one piece covering 20 which includes rim 81 and opening 82 adjacent the rim. A carrier plate 18 which also includes opening 62 adjacent opposite ends is mounted within housing 20. Mounting post 64 passes through holes 62 and 82 connecting plate 18 with cover 20 adjacent edge 80. Also, elements 86 secure plate 18 and cover 20 together.

Bolt 64 also secures the mirror assembly with a holder or the vehicle.

Cover 20 includes rim 81 which as shown in Fig. 3 does not effect movement of mirror element 12 between selected adjusted positions.

Specific claim language which distinguishes each claim over the prior art as

required by 37 CFR 1.111(b) will now be pointed to.

Claim 6, drawn to a method, clearly defines over the method taught by Catlin, et al for the following reasons.

Claim 6 calls for providing a carrier plate having a clamping recess thereon and locating the carrier plate spaced apart from the rim and the cover. In Catlin, et al. the carrier plate 18 does not include a clamping recess but rather is provided with bolt receiving apertures 62 at opposed ends. The reference does not include the step of clamping the clamping recess to a holder. Rather, the plate is connected with the cover 20 by bolts 64 passing through apertures 60 and 82. In Catlin, et al, there is no recess, only mounting post 64 to secure with a holder.

Clearly, claim 6 defines over the Catlin, et al reference.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 6 and are therefore also thought to be allowable.

Claim 10, drawn to apparatus 1, clearly defines over the Catlin, et al reference for the following reasons.

Claim 10 calls for a holder depending through the housing into the interior.

In Catlin, et al, mounting post 64 engages with the upper and lower edges of carrier 18. The post does not extend into the interior but rather extend outwardly and away from.

The claim calls for the carrier plate to define a base portion with a clamping recess for clamping attachment with the carrier. The claim further calls for the carrier plate to be arranged in spaced apart position from the rim and the covering.

In Catlin, et al, carrier plate 18 does not include a recess for clamping with the holder. In the reference, a pair mounting post 64 extend through opposed ends of the

holder and secure with the vehicle or a holder. Further, carrier plate 18 is engaged with the cover adjacent the rim by post 64 and screws 86.

For these reasons, claim 10 clearly defines over the Catlin, et al reference.

Claim 2-5 and 12 depend from claim 10 and are also thought to be allowable.

An earnest effort has been made to place the case in allowable condition. It is therefore, urged that the examiner find the claims, as now presented, to be allowable and pass the case to issue in the due course of PTO business.

A telephone interview is requested should the examiner feel such would further the prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry \$. Jaudon

Registration 34,056

McNair Law Firm, PA P.O. Box 10827

Greenville, SC 29603-0827

Telephone: (864) 232-4261

Agent for the Applicant